

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed on September 9, 2004. Claims 1-8 are pending in the application. Claim 1 is in independent form. By the present amendment, Claims 1-8 have been amended. No new matter or issues are believed to be introduced by the amendments.

Claims 2-8 have been amended to place the claims in conformance with United States practice.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claim 1 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 1-3 and 5 of co-pending Application No. 09/912,470. Claim 1 of the present application, as well as Claim 1 of the co-pending application, have been amended in a manner which is believed to obviate the provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection over Claims 1-3 and 5 of co-pending Application No. 09/912,470. Accordingly, withdrawal of the provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection with respect to Claim 1 of the present application is respectfully requested.

Further, in the Office Action, Claims 1-5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,002,367A issued to Engblom et al. on December 14, 1999 (“Engblom et al.”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,587,524 issued to Hall on May 5, 1986 (“Hall”). Claim 1 has been amended to better define Applicants’ invention and to overcome the cited rejection.

Claim 1 now recites:

A wireless terminal comprising a ground conductor housing and a transceiver housed by said ground conductor housing and coupled to an antenna feed, wherein the antenna feed is coupled directly to the ground conductor housing via a capacitor formed by a conducting plate

and a portion of the ground conductor housing and wherein a slot, partially located underneath the conducting plate, is provided in the ground conductor housing. (Emphasis Added) Support for the amendments can be found throughout Applicants' specification.

Engblom et al. is directed to an antenna device for placement inside and parallel to a non-conductive chassis or housing of an electrical device, such as a telephone. All of the components of the antenna device are situated inside the chassis and no component of the antenna device is coupled directly or indirectly to the chassis via a capacitor formed by a conducting plate and a portion of the ground conductor housing.

Hall does not cure the deficiencies of Engblom et al. Hall is directed to a reduced height monopole/slot antenna having generally parallel spaced ground planes, the upper one of which has a slot therein. Hall does not disclose or suggest an antenna feed directly coupled to a ground conductor housing via a capacitor formed by a conducting plate and a portion of the ground conductor housing.

Hence, neither Engblom et al. nor Hall disclose or suggest, inter alia, a wireless terminal comprising a ground conductor housing and a transceiver housed by said ground conductor housing and coupled to an antenna feed, wherein the antenna feed is coupled directly to the ground conductor housing via a capacitor formed by a conducting plate and a portion of the ground conductor housing, as recited by Applicants' amended, independent Claim 1. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection with respect to Claim 1 and allowance thereof are respectfully requested.

Claims 2-5 depend from Claim 1, and therefore include the limitations of Claim 1. Hence, for the same reasons given above for Claim 1, Claims 2-5 are believed to contain

patentable subject matter. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection with respect to Claims 2-5 and allowance thereof are respectfully requested.

Claims 6-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Engblom et al. and Hall as applied to Claim 1 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,424,300B1 issued to Sanford et al. on July 23, 2002 ("Sanford et al.").

Claims 6-8 depend from Claim 1, and therefore include the limitations of Claim 1. Hence, for the same reasons given above for Claim 1, Claims 6-8 are believed to contain patentable subject matter. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection with respect to Claims 6-8 and allowance thereof are respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all claims presently pending in the application, namely, Claims 1-8, are believed to be in condition for allowance and patentably distinguishable over the art of record.

If the Examiner should have any questions concerning this communication or feels that an interview would be helpful, the Examiner is requested to call Dicran Halajian, Esq., Intellectual Property Counsel, Philips Electronics North America, at 914-333-9607.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael A. Scaturro
Reg. No. 51,356
Attorney for Applicants

Mailing Address:
Intellectual Property Counsel
Philips Electronics North America Corp.
P.O. Box 3001
345 Scarborough Road
Briarcliff Manor, New York 10510-8001